

## REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed January 21, 2000, claims 1-16 were reviewed. Claims 1-16 stand rejected. Accordingly, claims 1-16 are now pending in the application.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments to the claims and the following remarks.

Claims 1-5, 7-10 and 12-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Pepe, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,673,322).

Claims 6 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), as being unpatentable over Pepe, et al. (U.S. Patent 5,673,322).

Claims 1, 7, 9, 12, 14 and 15 have been amended. Support for amended claims 1, 7, 9, 12, 14 and 15 is found in the specification. Applicants respectfully submit that amended claims 1, 7, 9, 12, 14 and 15 do not add new matter.

### Rejection of Claims 1-5, 7-10 and 12-16 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)

Claims 1-5, 7-10 and 12-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Pepe, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,673,322). The Examiner has stated that with respect to claim 1, Pepe discloses the claimed device, namely:

A device for providing wireless Internet access (Fig. 2) comprising:  
-an antenna (fig. 2, item 60), the antenna for receiving a set of wireless queries and transmitting a set of wireless responses (col. 7, lines 26-29); and  
- a program (Fig. 2, item 54), the program is for converting the set of wireless queries into Internet compatible protocols, the program is further for receiving a set of Internet protocol formatted responses corresponding to the set of wireless queries, the program is further for converting the set of Internet protocol formatted responses into the set of wireless responses (fig. 3, item 54, col. 7, lines 15-17 & col 8, lines 17-20).

Applicants respectfully submit, however, that *amended* claim 1 is not anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) in view of Pepe. Amended Claim 1 refers to

A device for providing wireless Internet access comprising:  
an antenna, the antenna for receiving a set of wireless queries and transmitting a set of wireless responses; and

a program configured to retrieve only dynamic data from an Internet source, the program is for converting the set of wireless queries into Internet compatible protocols, the program is further for receiving a set of Internet protocol formatted responses corresponding to the set of wireless queries, the program is further for converting the set of Internet protocol formatted responses into the set of wireless responses containing the dynamic data.

In contrast to the present invention, the Pepe reference discloses a system where both the static and dynamic information associated with an Internet source are communicated to a wireless device. As illustrated in the Pepe reference (See: Col. 12, lines 1- 64), an example is illustrated wherein data is exchanged between the remote proxy server and the local proxy server associated with the wireless device. During such an exchange, the remote server creates a service script containing the HTML page as the data object, and once the script is completed in an appropriate form, the service script is delivered to the local proxy. Accordingly, the local proxy has the responsibility of parsing through the service script, pulling out both the action and any associated data objects (i.e., the HTML page) with that action, and completing the requested action. So, to finish the example, the local proxy server would parse through to find out what the action was requested (writing a new HTML page), extract the data object (a new HTML page), and then write the data object to the local file distribution. (See Pepe, Col. 12, lines 1- 64).

As illustrated by Pepe, the reference system discloses a process and device wherein static and dynamic information associated with an Internet source (e.g., the data object) is communicated to a wireless device, rather than communicating only the dynamic data to the wireless device. As such, the Pepe reference necessarily requires the usage of additional bandwidth resources to communicate the static data, in addition to the dynamic data, to the wireless device.

Therefore, the Pepe reference does not disclose "...a program configured to retrieve only dynamic data from an Internet source, the program is for converting the set of wireless queries into Internet compatible protocols, the program is further for receiving a set of Internet protocol formatted responses corresponding to the set of wireless queries, the program is further for converting the set of Internet protocol formatted responses into the set of wireless responses containing the dynamic data", as recited in amended claim 1. As such, Applicants

respectfully submit that *amended* claim 1 is not anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) in view of Pepe.

Given that claims 2-8, which depend from independent claim 1, respectively, applicants respectfully submit that claims 2-8 are not anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) in view of Pepe.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-8. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-8 are now in condition for allowance.

Similarly, amended claim 9 and claim 12 contain claim language similar to that of claim 1, and as such, the argument presented in support of amended claim 1, likewise applies to amended claim 9 and amended claim 12.

Specifically, amended claim 9 recites:

A wireless access device for accessing Internet based information, the wireless access device comprising:

a transceiver for receiving a set of wireless queries and transmitting a set of wireless responses;

a [comptuer] computer, the computer being coupled to the transceiver;

a program configured to retrieve only dynamic data from an Internet source, the program is for converting the set of wireless queries into Internet compatible protocols, the program is further for receiving a set of Internet protocol formatted responses corresponding to the set of wireless queries, the program is further for converting the set of Internet protocol formatted responses into the set of wireless responses containing the dynamic data.

Similarly, amended claim 12 recites:

A device for providing wireless Internet access comprising:

first means for receiving a set of wireless queries for retrieving only dynamic data and transmitting a set of wireless responses containing dynamic data; and

second means for converting the set of wireless queries into Internet compatible protocols, the second means is further for receiving a set of Internet protocol formatted responses corresponding to the set of wireless queries, the second means is further for converting the set of Internet protocol formatted responses into the set of wireless responses.

As illustrated by Pepe, the reference system discloses a process and device wherein static and dynamic information associated with an Internet source is communicated to a wireless

device, rather than communicating the only dynamic data to the wireless device. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that *amended* claim 9 and *amended* claim 12 are not anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) in view of Pepe.

Given that claims 10-11, which depend from independent claim 9, respectively, applicants respectfully submit that claims 10-11 are not anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) in view of Pepe.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 9-11, as well as rejection of claim 12. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 9-12 are now in condition for allowance.

The Examiner has stated that with respect to claim 13, Pepe discloses the claimed device, namely:

A wireless communications device comprising:  
-a transceiver (Fig. 2, item 58) for wireless communications over at least a first wireless network and a second wireless network (col. 7, lines 15-30);  
- a memory for storing a program and a set of data, the set of data including a set of markup language formatted descriptions, the set of data being previously installed on the wireless communications device (col. 12, lines 25-45); and  
- a program for accessing the set of data and for rendering a form from the set of data, the program further for supporting input into the wireless communications device, the input for completing the form, the program further for generating a wireless communications query corresponding to the form (fig. 3, item 54, col. 7, lines 15-17 and col. 8, lines 17-20).

In response, Applicants submit claim 13 is not anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) in view of Pepe. As argued above, the reference system of Pepe discloses a process and device wherein static and dynamic information associated with an Internet source is communicated to a wireless device, rather than communicating only the dynamic data to the wireless device. As such, the Pepe reference necessarily requires the usage of additional bandwidth resources to communicate the static data, in addition to the dynamic data, to the wireless device.

As such, in the Pepe reference, there would not be a need to have a set of data being previously installed, as new data comprising both the static and dynamic data is downloaded into the wireless device during a communication /data exchange. Moreover, the cited sections of the Pepe reference (col. 12, lines 25-45) does not disclose the usage of a memory device, or otherwise disclose, teach, or otherwise suggest "...a memory for storing a program and a set of data, the set of data including a set of markup language formatted descriptions, the set of

data being previously installed on the wireless communications device...”, as recited in claim 13. Applicants request that the Examiner identify such a memory or memory device, as recited in claim 13, within the Pepe reference.

In addition, the cited section of the Pepe reference (fig. 3, item 54, col. 7, lines 15-17 and col. 8, lines 17-20) does not disclose, teach, or otherwise suggest “a program for accessing the set of data and for rendering a form from the set of data, the program further for supporting input into the wireless communications device, the input for completing the form, the program further for generating a wireless communications query corresponding to the form”, as recited in claim 13. Applicants request that the Examiner identify such a program, as recited in claim 13, within the Pepe reference.

Therefore, the Pepe reference does not disclose “... a memory for storing a program and a set of data, the set of data including a set of markup language formatted descriptions, the set of data being previously installed on the wireless communications device...” or “... a program for accessing the set of data and for rendering a form from the set of data, the program further for supporting input into the wireless communications device, the input for completing the form, the program further for generating a wireless communications query corresponding to the form”, as recited in amended claim 13. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 13 is not anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) in view of Pepe.

Given that claims 14-16, which depend from independent claim 13, respectively, applicants respectfully submit that claims 14-16 are not anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) in view of Pepe.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 13-16. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 13-16 are now in condition for allowance.

#### Rejection of Claims 6 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 6 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), as being unpatentable over Pepe, et al. (U.S. Patent 5,673,322). Accordingly, claims 6 and 11 depend from independent claim 1 and independent claim 9, respectively, which Applicants submit are not anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) in view of Pepe. Correspondingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claims 6 and 11. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 6 and 11 are now in condition for allowance.

Summary

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are now in condition for allowance. Such allowance is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner finds any remaining impediment to the prompt allowance of these claims that could be clarified with a telephone conference, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Stephen Warhola at (650) 565-3878.

Deposit Account Authorization

Authorization is hereby given to charge our Deposit Account No. 23-2415 (Atty. Doc. 25216.704) for any charges that may be due. Furthermore, if an extension is required, then applicants hereby request such extension.

Conclusion

It is submitted that the present application is in form for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,  
WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI

By: 

Stephen Warhola  
Registration No. 43,237

WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI  
650 Page Mill Road  
Palo Alto, California 94304-1050  
Telephone: (650) 493-9300  
Date: May 22, 2000